

**California Workforce Investment Board
Meeting Minutes
March 15, 2000**

The California Workforce Investment Board held a meeting on Wednesday, March 15, 2000, at the Sacramento Convention Center, Sacramento, California. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gotlieb.

Members in Attendance

Mr. Patrick Ainsworth (designee for Superintendent Delaine Eastin)	Mr. Don Hunsucker
Assembly Member Dion Aroner	Secretary Grantland Johnson
Mr. Bob Balgenorth	Mr. Sukhee Kang
Ms. Barbara Beck	Mr. James Kellogg
Mr. Norris Bishton	Ms. Marsha Kwalwasser
Mr. Bill Blase	Mr. Robert Levy
Mr. Les Breckenridge	Mr. Kirk Lindsey
Mr. Kenneth Burt	Mr. Richard Mendlen
Mr. Jerry Butkiewicz	Ms. Kathleen Milnes
Mr. Robert Carpenter	Mr. Elvin Moon
Mr. James Crettol	Mr. Frank Moran
Ms. Mary Edington	Chancellor Tom Nussbaum
Mr. Tom Ellick	Supervisor Pat Paul
Ms. Chris Essel	Mr. Art Pulaski
Mr. Tal Finney (designee for Governor Gray Davis)	Mr. Frank Quintero
Mr. Victor Franco	Mr. Roland Rapp
Ms. Elizabeth Freeman	Mr. Arturo Rodriguez
Mr. Larry Gotlieb	Ms. Elizabeth Savage
Mr. Mark Harris (designee for Secretary Maria Contreras-Sweet)	Ms. Rona Sherriff (designee for Senator Patrick Johnston)
Mr. Scott Hauge	Mr. Steve Smith
Ms. Mary Haywood	Assembly Member Darrell Steinberg
Mr. Stephen Holloway (designee for Senator Hilda Solis)	Ms. Elizabeth Tyler
	Mr. Thomas Zenty

Members Absent

Mr. Charles Bertucio	Mr. Jack McNally
Mr. Charles Blake	Mr. Cecil Murray
Ms. Doreen Chiu	Mr. Bill Noce
Mr. Dave Condit	Mr. Bill Pauli
Ms. Carlene Ellis	Mr. Robert Pike
Mr. Bob Foster	Mayor Miguel Pulido
Mr. Van Johnson	Mr. Isiah Turner
Ms. Laura Lauder	Mr. Don Whitaker
Mr. Mark Macarro	Mr. John Williams
Mr. Thomas May	

Opening Remarks:

Chairman Gotlieb opened the meeting by welcoming members to the second meeting of the California Workforce Investment Board (State Board). He addressed the agenda and reviewed the goals for the day: to consider public comment on California's Strategic Five-Year Plan for the Workforce Investment Act (the Plan); to approve the Plan with changes added, while acknowledging that over time the document will change; and to consider Board members' comments on agenda items for the day. The Chair acknowledged Mr. Levy's attendance at all public hearings for the Plan. Mr. Gotlieb also mentioned that future State Board meetings will be held in the Bay Area or Los Angeles this year. A schedule of meetings will be forthcoming. The Chair recognized a quorum in attendance.

1. ACTION ITEM

Subject: APPROVAL OF JANUARY 27-28, 2000 STATE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Motion: Moved for approval and seconded.

Discussion: No changes to the minutes were requested and motion passed unanimously.

2. DISCUSSION ITEM

**Subject: PROPOSED INITIAL STATE BOARD COMMITTEE STRUCTURE
 PROPOSED STATE BOARD BY-LAWS**

Discussion:

Chairman Gotlieb stressed the need for a committee structure to do the work of the Board and deferred to Secretary of Health and Human Services, Grantland Johnson. Mr. Johnson turned members' attention to the proposed committee structure in the agenda packet and spoke first about the Executive Committee. This committee can provide guidance between Board meetings for the staff conducting the day-to-day business that cannot be handled by the full Board. Issues arise that need to be dealt with expeditiously and the Executive Committee will be responsible for this.

The Operations Committee was authorized in Executive Order D-9-99. This important committee will be responsible for facilitating the State's inter-agency cooperation for the purpose of integration and development of the one-stop service delivery system. This will be the venue for common program operation discussions.

The Performance Based Accountability (PBA) Committee will initially have ten members and its efforts will focus on developing policies to implement a comprehensive performance-based accountability system, using objective data to evaluate California's workforce development system and direct its continuous improvement.

The Economic Analysis, Planning and Systems Development Committee will focus on the myriad issues of special populations (veterans, homeless, disabled, etc.) and ensure that these groups have a voice. It will be responsible for forming sub-groups to maintain integration and cohesiveness. The Committee will address labor market trends, changes in industries and occupations, and best practices. Non-Board members will be invited to participate.

Mr. Lindsay indicated his concern with the committee structure because there is, as proposed, limited private sector representation. There is reference on the Operations Committee for private sector participation, but nowhere else is the private sector mentioned in the committee structure. Chairman Gotlieb confirmed the intent to have private sector representation on each committee and subcommittee.

Mr. Zenty asked if the State Board would rely on committee and sub-committee reports. Chairman Gotlieb responded that the intention is to have well-informed members address important issues in committee reports. Mr. Zenty then recommended that the majority of committee members, at least in the first year, be composed of State Board members.

3. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject: CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON DISCUSSION ITEM 2

Mr. George Kurtz, a public advocate, stated that the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems need to be added to the State Board. He referenced SB 43 and past resolutions by the legislature. He indicated that all workforce development is based in education. The legislature's master plan for education should be woven into WIA. Chairman Gotlieb asked Mr. Kurtz to submit letters or written testimony to staff or the Governor's office.

Ms. Virginia Hamilton, Executive Director of the California Workforce Association (CWA) expressed her support of the proposed committee structure and its inclusiveness. She also requested that private sector members be fully utilized on the Board. She acknowledged Cisco Systems and other technology companies' ability to develop ways to do work differently. She recommended that the State Board and committees meet more often to accomplish the work needed to get the system up and running.

Mr. Dan Kysor expressed his appreciation that the Board has gone beyond what he expected, but stated that access to the website for sightless people needs to be considered. Information systems in the One-Stop Centers must be user friendly to the disabled (blind, deaf, etc). He encouraged the System to look beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) rather than rely on Department of Rehabilitation for ADA compliance.

Dr. Cheryl Stecher, contracting entity for the Performance Based Accountability (PBA) system, discussed accountability issues and encouraged members to sign up for the PBA Committee. She stated that the PBA Committee has existed for two years and that much work has been done. She stated that the third year will be exciting, that the system is unique, including strong collaboration among state agencies.

Ms. Marilyn Johnson from the Sacramento Urban League urged the Board to include Community Based Organizations (CBOs), indicating they are not represented on the State Board. She stated that CBOs have experience with the harder-to-serve populations and with individuals with high barriers to employment.

Mr. Don Harper, President of the California Association of Inter-Service Agencies, requested the State Board to attend to veterans' issues. He suggested a veterans' subcommittee and stated this request is supported by State Board member and veteran Mr. Robert Pike. This appointment would indicate that the Board is serious about inclusion of veterans and would best serve all interested parties.

Ms. Kathryn Wallace Johnson, employer, service provider, and a private post-secondary representative, requested that the Board recognize the importance of private post-secondary organizations and provide funding for their programs.

Discussion:

Mr. Ainsworth expressed support for UC, CSU, and private universities to be specified members of committees and subcommittees, and that this be reflected in the by-laws. Mr. Gotlieb responded that the by-laws are an initial cut, and the UC system is already consulted on technical issues. He agreed that the CSU and UC systems are important.

Mr. Zenty requested that the authority vested in the State Board be reflected in the by-laws. He requested seminars be held for Board members' benefit. Mr. Gotlieb concurred and directed staff to schedule sessions on State Board membership in the Bay Area and Los Angeles.

4. ACTION ITEM

Subject: CALL FOR VOTE ON DISCUSSION ITEM 2

Motion: It was moved and seconded that the State Board approve the proposed by-laws and committee structure.

The board unanimously voted to approve by-laws and committee structure.

Discussion: None at this point of the agenda.

5. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject:

- **REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS**
- **REVIEW OF PUBLIC AND STATE BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS ON THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE STRATEGIC FIVE-YEAR STATE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT PLAN FOR TITLE I OF WIA, SECTIONS I-V AND GENERAL COMMENTS**

Discussion:

Chairman Gottlieb thanked Board members who attended the public meetings and asked them to summarize their experiences. Mr. Hunsucker discussed the excitement that exists for the possibility of change that was expressed at the Fresno meeting. Mr. Moran attended the Los Angeles meeting and expressed four concerns that emerged: 1) One-Stops need clear direction from the State on how to refer a client to training; 2) conflicting processes need to be aligned, for example services provided by community colleges and the private sector; 3) private and post-secondary schools are concerned with their lack of inclusion; and 4) that the system is not user friendly to small business. Mr. Moran reinforced that these concerns need to be addressed for the State to be successful.

Mr. Crettol attended the Fresno meeting where he heard a need for coordinating and consolidating services and information sharing. He reported hearing that the State Board should set the standards and leave the locals alone. English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and vocational training are absolutely crucial for the Central Valley. He shared an idea brought up at the hearing about developing a Winnebago classroom, to take the classes to the people who cannot get to classes on their own.

Mr. Levy recounted his experiences at the public meetings and thanked the staff who conducted them. He said he learned that we need to listen and respect the impact that this system has on people. He gave special thanks to Mr. Maguy, who urged State Board members to dedicate their time to make this work, to learn to be a guide and a coach. He stated there is a role for education. The State needs to stretch dollars by leveraging monies and developing true partnerships.

Chairman Gottlieb turned to staff and asked them to explain the public comment process. State Board staff assured that all comments were considered and that the majority or a consensus on issues will be included in the plan or used toward policy. State Board staff indicated that there were six hearings conducted to solicit comments on the plan. Meetings were advertised on the website and through a mass mailing of 7000 announcements. A total of 45 hours were dedicated to public hearings and comments were also received through the website. More than 300 comments were received on the Strategic 5-Year Plan.

Section I-Plan Development Process: Staff explained that comments on this section were technical amendment proposals from the first State Board meeting and the public comment process. Staff clarified that changes are in bold and strikeouts are shown.

Section II-State Vision and Goals: Staff indicated that there was a consensus on amendments provided. There were several comments that suggested the vision was not inclusive and that many stakeholders did not feel a part of the vision. Staff recommended that the Board look at the language to be more inclusive. Public comments are also being used to flesh out possible policy options; one comment was that the Regional Workforce Policy and Economic Development Act (RWPEDA) be included in the plan for information purposes only.

Discussion:

Mr. Ellick stated that if RWPEDA is significant then he needs clarification before voting on changes to the Plan. Staff recommended that the Board explore the relationship with the RWPEDA plan and possible future policy opportunities. Ms. Sherriff explained the history of RWPEDA. She stated that it's not a plan but a framework constructed during welfare reform for regional service delivery projects and strategic planning. Consequently, the State Board may want to adopt part of it. Mr. Ellick stated that the State Board has not studied or looked at the RWPEDA plan, and asked how locked in the Board is by their decisions on it today.

Mr. Rosselli, Acting Executive Director of the State Board, remarked that RWPEDA was submitted as an extension of public comments. Chairman Gotlieb stated that perhaps RWPEDA could be part of a future seminar. Mr. Ellick asked if RWPEDA is an integral part of the day's discussion. Mr. Lindsay supported Mr. Ellick's concern. Ms. Sherriff responded that RWPEDA is recognition of the more comprehensive workforce development system in California. Mr. Quintero agreed with Mr. Lindsay, stating that it's premature to include RWPEDA. Secretary Johnson encouraged members to focus on the partnership RWPEDA creates and the framework it offers as a possible method of implementing WIA. Assembly Member Aroner requested a change in the language on page 47, from "as required by RWPEDA" to "as referenced by RWPEDA." Mr. Art Pulaski seconded Assembly Member Aroner's comments and requested that they be an amendment to the plan. Mr. Nussbaum supported the motions.

Section III-Assessment of California's Economic Environment: Staff summarized comments on this section and stated that the scope of California's economy as mentioned in the draft plan is too narrow and does not recognize the various regions and variations in the economy. Another comment indicated that projected skill development needs are best addressed at the local level. A member pointed out an error on page 52 of the Plan regarding unemployment rates.

Staff continued the discussion of Section III (B) and summarized comments that to date the Board has conducted business without local input. It was suggested that language be softened to demonstrate collaboration among all partners and levels of government so as to ensure forums for local input.

State Board staff described Section III (B)(1)(c) relating to Local Boards. Comments included suggestions to not allow “grandfathering” of Private Industry Councils, that all Local Boards be new, and that Board membership be limited to statutory requirements. A deadline needs to be established to certify Local Boards to comply with the DOL. Staff recommended a December 31, 2000 deadline.

Staff continued the discussion on Section III (B)(3)(c) regarding the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). The draft State Plan includes the ETPL workgroup’s preliminary policies and procedures for the ETPL. Major comments on the ETPL are that Regional Occupational Center Programs (ROC/Ps) be included; that eligibility procedures and effective accountability be established; and that the ETPL be more flexible. Initial and subsequent eligibility procedures are currently being developed. Given the absence of any certifying procedures that are WIA specific, eligible provider programs will be certified by existing norms (Bureau of Private and Postsecondary Vocational Education (BPPVE), California Department of Education (CDE), Title IV of Higher Education Act, etc.). Concerns were raised about the length of time needed to certify new providers/programs.

Ms. Kwalwasser suggested that staff strike from page 72 the statement “California has chosen not to use performance criteria” to “Standards for providers on the list will be recognized by alternative methods.” She stated that California has used standards but that they may be different than what will ultimately be used. Staff concurred that for initial placement on the ETPL there are no new criteria beyond existing certifying norms, but that subsequent eligibility on the list will have performance requirements as specified by WIA.

Mr. Butkiewicz agreed with Ms. Milnes’ comments about youth councils on page 57. He suggested that the second paragraph should read “private sector and organized labor” while striking “where appropriate.”

Mr. Franco addressed the names of the One-Stop centers. He has visited One-Stops in Los Angeles and other areas of Southern California and noticed that they all have different names. He recommended that One-Stops have a common identifying name.

Ms. Sherriff asked if the State added any data elements beyond federal requirements, and if the local areas will be ready for July 1, 2000 implementation. Staff responded that the State has not added any data requirements and that there are no anticipated problems for the local areas at this time. The EDD has conducted a feasibility study for initial ETPL processes, but has not identified an ultimate solution.

Mr. Crettol stated he anticipates youth funds will be reduced. His area will only be able to serve 1000 youth instead of the usual 3000. He recommended that the 15% set aside funds be used to supplement the shortages in youth funds in the first year.

Section IV—Strategies for Improvement: Staff stated that the proposed revisions are based on comments received for technical amendments. Staff has strengthened the language and included language on capacity building of the Local Boards. Clearer language about displaced homemakers was included at the bottom of page 81. Staff discussed employment statistics and how the system may be more comprehensive and include better customer information.

Section V—Performance Management and Measurement: Staff stated that there are no proposed revisions to this section at this time because the State is currently in negotiations with DOL. The draft State Plan includes the schedule of performance level negotiations, the process to certifying local boards, and the ETPL procedures as an attachment. Staff addressed attachment F and comments that the Local Board application and certification document be stricken from the document and that the workgroup members on ETPL and their affiliations be added.

Mr. Moran questioned data integration and confidentiality issues. Staff agreed that this is a big issue related to the Operations Committee.

Mr. Zenty questioned incentive criteria for superior performers and remarked that a data driven analysis of this issue is needed.

Ms. Milnes stated that many occupations aren't part of the Standard Occupational Classifications and O-Net, including entertainment and technology industries. She stated a need for other criteria for occupations that require training.

Mr. Pulaski referred to page 98, B-1, and commented that the State has not recognized the need for quality assurance for on the job training. Staff responded that these provisions are directly out of the law.

6. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ON DISCUSSION ITEM 5

Mr. Bob Lanter stated that CWA is confused about the RWPEDA language and supported the comments made earlier today to change the language. He urged the Board to amend the plan to say that the Governor will certify all workforce investment boards, or at least give them temporary certification. He recommended that all local boards meeting minimum criteria be certified, temporarily, so that WIA can be implemented legally. He stated concern that the grants and contracts language wasn't amended. He stated that the standard unemployment rate allocation method is fundamentally disconnected with the statute. Mr. Lanter recommended that the State Board make a specific recommendation on hold harmless and explore other methods of funding (15%, Wagner-Peyser, etc.).

Mr. Pete Parra, Kern County Supervisor, addressed the hold harmless provision. He asked the Board to be consistent with the Governor's Economic Summit in the Central Valley. He requested the Board invest in the Central Valley to battle what is recession era unemployment.

Ms. Emmie Guntermund stated that many disabled people are not diagnosed as such and thereby suffer under the assumptions that they are crazy and lazy. She stated that many of these people do not have the minimum skills to even pass the GAIN test. People with learning disabilities are a huge and invisible population in the Community Colleges. However, after these people have been properly diagnosed they become active members in their communities, go to work, and make excellent employees.

Mr. John Nylon from the Kern, Inyo, Mono Workforce Investment Board stated hold harmless is perhaps the single largest issue the State Board will have to discuss. Under hold harmless the State would have to return monies that would otherwise be provided to areas that have five times less unemployment than do Kern, Inyo, Mono Counties. He stated standard allocation makes sense because it addresses the immediate needs in areas with high unemployment and poverty. Also, One-Stops are being used by people who are underemployed, not those who are able to negotiate the labor market on their own. In terms of per capita income, the Central Valley's per capita income is 71% less than the rest of California. He requested the State Board to identify priorities by investing in the areas that are not benefiting from the current economic boom; and to oppose the hold harmless issue.

Ms. Marilyn Johnson from the Sacramento Urban League addressed the State's hard to serve populations. The Sacramento Urban League would like to see the State Board give the hard to serve populations the ability to develop and manage their own career plans.

Ms. Marty Finnegan, Napa County Workforce Investment Board, asked the State to apply hold harmless, as her area would otherwise be devastated. She stated that hold harmless stabilizes programs and although Napa County is a wealthy county, they still need funding to serve people. She stated without hold harmless they cannot continue to put into

practice all of the work we've done. She suggested the State Board wait for the 2000 census data for a better understanding of the State.

Mr. Joe Daniel, Tulare County Private Industry Council, said that they would like to use an alternative entity as a Local Board. A letter submitted in November indicated Tulare County had met the statutory board criteria. The WIA allows for the use of alternative entities and they requested the Board to allow them to do so.

Mr. Glen Brooks from the San Mateo County Human Services Agency argued that allocation formulas often result in unforeseen consequences and some localities need additional funding. He stated without hold harmless the State would reduce their programs by 1/3. Therefore, he suggested that the State Board leverage the reduction in monies from the Governor's 15% discretionary funds or Wagner-Peyser funds.

Mr. Charles Brown from NorTEC/Butte thanked staff for changes made over the last few weeks, particularly to page 70 in the agenda packet regarding the selection of providers for ITAs. He recommended that the State Board continually debate ETPL and ITA policies. These policies are important and form the cornerstone of the entire system and customer choice.

Ms. Ermilinda Sapien from the Sacramento Center for Employment and Training expressed her concerns that special needs populations will not be reached in a self-directed system. She expressed hope that there will be flexible eligibility standards for these groups and that the State Board will take an active role in assisting CBO's transition to WIA.

Mr. Blake Konzcal from the South Bay PIC expressed his concerns that local elected officials aren't being allowed to use alternative entities. He expressed concern that the Board is focusing on the process as opposed to the results. He stated the Board should concentrate on results and allow the locals the flexibility to achieve the goals. Regarding the requirement on page 63 of locals (open system architecture of the electronic infrastructure and access via the Internet), he asked the Board to ensure that whatever the state requires the locals to do, the State should do the same.

Mr. John Delmatier from Proteus stated that he strongly supported comments made by Supervisor Pete Parra. He stated that they have suggested using a model similar to DOL's structure of national programs. Couldn't the State have an office for statewide programs? He also advocated for funding regional initiatives from the State, because locals are limited to 10% administration costs. Lastly, he stated that the State Plan does not specify data to be collected from each program. The Board will need to mandate the collection of data, whether it be through WIA or the state partners.

Ms. Nancy Wagner, Director of Workforce Development at the Los Angeles Office of Education advocated specific criteria for local board and youth council membership to ensure that education representatives come from the workforce development field (ROC/P's and K-12, page 56). She recommended that existing academic achievement criteria be used to ensure alignment with CDE for all youth services and performance measures (pages 44, 61). On page 84 she recommended inter-agency agreements to ensure cooperation that integrates youth services and programs. She also suggested

accessing unspent CalWORKS and Welfare-to-Work funds prior to using WIA monies. Ms. Wagner encouraged local boards to help participants to access all public education training providers before private providers.

Ms. Karen Fies, Sonoma County, referenced the attachment on page 72 (ETPL Policy and Procedures), stating that it's much too detailed to be an attachment. She also stated that the standard allocation formulas don't pertain to youth programs and supported using hold harmless rules to provide universal access.

Mr. Jim Simpson from the Shasta Private Industry Council, requested that the Board not allow the use of or certify alternative entities that would be destructive to the local systems in place currently.

Mr. Joseph Werner from the Monterey County Workforce Investment Board, stated that his local board has asked not to advocate hold harmless although it will impact them negatively. The bigger picture is to adequately fund the system and to be advocates for employment, economic development, and global competitiveness. Hold harmless affects smaller jurisdictions but the question is how much of a hero the Board wants to be. He stated 100,000 youth will not be employed this summer because of the money situation but there are options to resolve this, such as TANF monies, federal action, etc. He stated their point is that the Board needs to support those who need it most.

Mr. Tom Netting from Corinthian Colleges Incorporated, offered his services as a consultant or advisor. He stated there should be more representation of education on the State Board. He stated he represents 44 institutions that all accept ITAs in several states. He suggested that the Board recognize two other organizations: California Private Post-secondary Schools and California Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (CASFAA.) Also, on page 53, there are no references to teaching and allied health professions.

Mr. Don Harper stated CBOs have presented much comment at the public hearings and have submitted written testimony. A total of 17 submissions were made but were summarized for the State Board packet. These organizations would like their comments documented.

7. ACTION ITEM

Subject: CALL FOR VOTE ON DISCUSSION ITEM 5: TO ACCEPT ANY AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS I, II, III, IV, AND V, AND FORWARD THE REVISED STATE PLAN TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Motion: THE BOARD MOVED SEPARATELY ON EACH SECTION OF THE PLAN AND UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ACCEPT AND FORWARD IT TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

Discussion:

Staff provided a summary of the amendments proposed by Board members under Discussion Item 5. The following list was provided to members.

1. **Pg. 47**, (Aroner) Delete the words "as required by RWPEDA".
2. **Pg. 51**, (Franco) Clarify statement to read: Policy for selection of One-Stop operators and certification of One-Stop systems "will include uniform identification for One-Stop Certified Centers."
3. **Pg. 52**, Market Analysis, Section A. (Balgenorth): Second paragraph, change language under key trends to read "from low unemployment numbers in the Bay Area to higher unemployment numbers in the Central Valley". Add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph: "One example for the public sector is the great need for teachers, nurses, and paraprofessionals."
4. **Pg. 53**, (Ainsworth) third paragraph, change "soft skills" to "essential employability skills."
5. **Pg. 57**, second paragraph (Butkiewicz): Add "'private sector and organized labor" and delete "where appropriate".
6. **Pg. 60**, (Ainsworth) Item 9 - Add word "education" to read "employment, education and training services"
7. **Pg 61**, (Milnes) Add a bullet stating: "Demonstrate program can provide new and innovative training."
8. **Pg. 61**, (Ainsworth) Add third bullet to top section: "There should be statewide uniform performance measures that are aligned with the State's education assessment and accountability system."
9. **Pg. 85**, Add (as fourth bullet) "The State Youth Council", if it's adopted.
10. **Pg. 98**, (Nussbaum) Add at end of number 3.b. to read: "or Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges."
11. **Pg. 98**, IV.B.2: (Balgenorth) After the parenthesis "(National Apprenticeship Act)", add the words "or provide on the job training in the construction industry and". After "...required information, including" add "a certificate of approval by the California Apprenticeship Council (CAC), as well as any additional information".
12. **Pg. 113**, Item 66: (Milnes): add footnote: "Not limited to the SOC/O-NET codes for emerging occupations."

Chairman Gotlieb introduced the block amendment of suggested changes mentioned by Board members in the morning session. Mr. Rosselli explained the process of the block amendment(s) to the plan.

Mr. Nussbaum suggested that item ten on the block of amendments be referenced to page 72 and the ETPL.

Mr. Hauge was concerned that “soft skills” on item number four on the block of amendments had been changed to “employability skills.” Mr. Ainsworth indicated that “soft skills” are the important skills and people can grapple with the language. He stated that the word “soft” diminishes its importance and noted that it was adopted by the State Job Training Coordinating Council. Mr. Hauge responded that he didn’t disagree with the statement but that he’s concerned people will not understand the language.

Mr. Moran commented on page 53, paragraph 3, line 2, that the Board identify the ESL component and raised a concern about item four on the block amendment list. Chairman Gotlieb asked if Mr. Moran could raise the issue after the block amendment is considered.

Mr. Ellick commented on the word as “required by RWPEDA” and suggested that it be substituted with “reference.” Mr. Pulaski agreed with Mr. Ellick and mentioned that Assembly Member Aroner proposed this language. Mr. Pulaski had no opposition to the proposed change.

Mr. Balgenorth stated that California has high standards for apprenticeship programs through the California Apprenticeship Council and that they set criteria and regulations for programs.

Mr. Moran expressed concern with item eight and requested clarification. Mr. Ainsworth responded that within the education system the state must grapple with the problem of assessing and holding the schools accountable. Educational attainment is a top priority for youth under WIA and the State should be able to use consistent measures to see how students are attaining these skills. The State needs to align youth measures with the Governor’s education agenda. Mr. Moran stated that he feared it may have a dramatic and negative impact on certain segments of the population and indicated it’s not fair to them. He moved that item eight be taken off the list and was seconded by Chairman Gotlieb. Mr. Gotlieb stated that item eight would be considered as a separate item.

Mr. Butkiewicz stated that he supports the Governor’s education goals but that he’s concerned that the Local Board will not be allowed to identify the measurements and criteria. He did not support item eight. Mr. Burt supported uniform standards.

Mr. Lindsay questioned item three that isolates nurses, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Mr. Balgenorth concurred and staff corrected the record.

Ms. Sandronsky suggested that on item eight that language be changed from “there should...” to “there shall...” as “should” is an ambiguous legal term.

Chairman Gotlieb asked for a motion to vote on the package minus item eight. Motion made, seconded and the amendment passed unanimously without item eight. Discussion followed on item eight.

Ms. Kwalwasser asked if there must be statewide uniformity or is the point performance standards. Mr. Ainsworth responded that the state uses the Star Test and it seems to be a good measuring device. Mr. Ainsworth then moved for passage of item eight.

Mr. Crettol responded that he had a problem with this amendment because in the Central Valley there is a large migrant seasonal farmworker population who may not be able to meet these standards. Ms. Tyler stated that she had no questions regarding a requirement to have statewide standards. She's concerned about linking the workforce development system with the K-12 system, however. She suggested a change in the amendment to replace "aligned with" with "compatible with". Ms. Sherriff agreed with this suggestion. Mr. Rosselli stated that the suggested language has been accepted.

Mr. Moran opposed this item. He stated that this might cut out a large group of people and leave them behind. The goal of the system is about helping low income people go to the next level and to make unemployable people, employable. By leaving out these education standards we are better able to serve the community. Mr. Moran stated that he's not familiar enough with the education standards to be in favor of this and thusly will vote no. Mr. Rosselli read the item: there shall be statewide uniformity that is compatible with the state education system.

Mr. Lindsay asked if these are the only criteria for measurement. Mr. Ainsworth responded that there are several measurements in the WIA and that every student that goes through the system will be assessed for their educational skill attainment. A member asked if this means someone in training who doesn't meet these criteria would no longer be eligible for training. If so, he could not support this. Mr. Rosselli asked for staff input on this question and staff responded that references to standards for youth criteria are absent because they have just been issued by DOL. The State has asked Local Boards to ensure that training providers commit to collecting data for performance reporting. Staff stated this discussion would not impact standards or measures for youth program outcomes.

Mr. Lindsay asked whether he would need an educational component that meets the educational system's demands if he had a welding shop/apprenticeship program for 19-20 year olds. Did it mean that he could not just run an apprentice shop, but would need to have an educational component, which would compare and be measured against public schools? Staff deferred to Mr. Ainsworth to answer this question. Mr. Ainsworth responded that he doesn't know the answer to that question but that a consistent measure for educational skill attainment is needed.

Chairman Gotlieb asked for a vote on the issue. The members moved to vote on motion, was seconded, and the motion was defeated.

Mr. Mark Harris (designee of Secretary Contreras-Sweet) then asked Chairman Gotlieb about summer youth programs, hold harmless, and Mayor Pulido's letter and whether it will be acted upon today. Chairman Gotlieb then stated that hold harmless is only a discussion item and no action will be taken, as it is not part of the plan.

Section I-Plan Development Process: There was no discussion on this section, members moved and voted to approve technical changes.

Section II-State Vision and Goals: No discussion on this section, Mr. Moran moved for approval and was seconded by Mr. Ellick, and the motion carried.

Section III-Assessment of California's Economic Environment: Ms. Tyler stated that on pages 52 and 53 there is nothing in the plan about careers where there are huge shortages, such as nursing and health care. Further, on page 58, she would like to see an addition that requires a needs assessment for youth providers in the communities they propose to serve. She proposed adding "nursing" to the list on pages 52 and 58. Mr. Burt stated that teachers should be included on page 52 as an occupation. Ms. Tyler then explained that her intent wasn't just to add on occupation but the entire industry, private and public, of health care and nursing.

Mr. Moran asked what impact the amendments would have on some people. Are we excluding people by doing this? He asked that the phrase "and demographic make-up" be added to the first bullet on page 50. Staff stated that the information on page seven was obtained from the EDD Labor Market Information Division.

Ms. Milnes suggested that on page 72, regarding the ETPL, that there be alternative means for services and training providers.

Mr. Lindsay requested adding "and/or" after "CalWORKS recipients" on page 62.

After discussion Section III was adopted.

Section IV and V: Ms. Essel moved for approval, was seconded by Mr. Moran, and the motion was adopted without discussion.

8. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject: LETTER FROM MAYOR PULIDO REGARDING SUMMER YOUTH FUNDING AND HOLD HARMLESS

Discussion:

Chairman Gotlieb stated that staff received considerable input through the public testimony given today and asked that the meeting proceed in the interest of time.

Discussion followed relating to the State Board and the Governor's role in identifying funding allocation strategies.

9. INFORMATION ITEM

Subject: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION STATE PLAN

Discussion: PRESENTED BY DR. CATHERINE CAMPISI, DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION

Dr. Campisi summarized her department's plan and stressed that they are a mandatory partner in the One-Stop centers. The Department of Rehabilitation is the lead agency in helping people with disabilities access employment. Universal access in the context of the Americans with Disabilities Act will be a huge challenge under WIA. The Department of Rehabilitation plan will be accessible through WWW.CALWIA.ORG.

10. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject: CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1998 STATE PLAN

Discussion: PRESENTED BY MR. PATRICK AINSWORTH, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (CDE)

Mr. Ainsworth stated that the Carl Perkins Act was passed concurrent to the WIA and also has a deadline of April 1, 2000 for state plan submittal. CDE has approved the plan and has not received any opposing testimonies. Chapter 7 describes the connection of the Perkins Act with WIA. Statute requires that the plan be presented for review to the California Workforce Investment Board. The program provides supplemental funding of \$124 million to secondary and post-secondary schools.

Discussion followed regarding the Board's ability to review and approve the State Perkins plan in so little time. Ms. Essel, chairing on behalf of Mr. Gotlieb, stated that the State Board's vote would simply acknowledge receipt of the plan.

11. DISCUSSION ITEM

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ON DISCUSSION ITEM 10, CARL PERKINS STATE PLAN

Discussion: Ms. Nancy Wagner from the LA County Office of Education encouraged the Board to review the Perkins plan, which is in line with the WIA plan.

12. ACTION ITEM

Subject: CALL FOR VOTE ON DISCUSSION ITEM 10

Motion: That the State Board acknowledges receipt of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 State Plan.

Mr. Levy moved that the Board receives and files the plan. He was seconded. The motion was adopted.

Discussion: No further discussion was held at this time.

Closing Remarks: Chairman Gotlieb encouraged Board members to get their committee request signed and forwarded to staff by March 31. He stated that a schedule will be forthcoming for the remainder of meetings this year and the training seminars. Chairman Gotlieb adjourned the meeting.